

CASE NO.: HSI920030173US1
Serial No.: 10/674,155
February 15, 2005
Page 6

PATENT
Filed: September 29, 2003

Remarks

Reconsideration of the above-captioned application is respectfully requested. The indicated allowability of Claims 9, 12, and 23 is gratefully acknowledged.

The objection to Claims 18 and 19 have been cured hereby. Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15-18, and 20-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sacks et al., USPP 2003/0197968, and Claims 7, 14, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Sacks et al. in view of Miles, USPN 6,714,369.

The fact that Applicant has focussed its comments distinguishing the present claims from the applied references and countering certain rejections must not be construed as acquiescence in other portions of rejections not specifically addressed.

Independent Claims 1 and 16 as now amended specify that the direction of writing depends on whether longitudinal recording or perpendicular recording is used, as formerly recited in now-canceled Claims 6, 7, 18, and 19. While the primary reference discusses establishing opposite directions of writing for inner and outer disk regions, and notes tangentially the concepts of perpendicular recording and longitudinal recording, it fails to key the direction of writing to the type of recording. The secondary reference does not remedy this shortfall. Accordingly, the primary reference would always follow its writing direction regime regardless of what kind of recording is being used, in contrast to Claims 1 and 16 as now amended. The rejections of these claims and their respective dependent claims have been overcome.

In contrast, independent Claim 10 now recites executing random access writes to the mid-zone as disclosed on, e.g., page 9, last three lines continuing to page 10, end of paragraph of the present specification. Of relevance to amended Claim 10 is the allegation in the Office Action that the reserved zone

1189-11.AMD

CASE NO.: HSJ920030173US1
Serial No.: 10/674,155
February 15, 2005
Page 7

PATENT
Filed: September 29, 2003

of Sacks et al. "is interpreted by the examiner" to be a random update zone. It decidedly is not. As taught in the relied-upon paragraph 26 of Sacks et al., the reserved zone either has no data, or only magnetic interference. It is not used for random writes; certainly, in marked contrast to Claim 10, there is no teaching or suggestion in Sacks et al. of executing random writes to the reserved region. The rejection of Claim 10 and its respective dependent Claims has been overcome.

The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (619) 338-8075 for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1189-11.AMD